

Serial No. 10/786,854  
Confirmation No. 3632

### REMARKS

To begin with Applicant thanks the Examiner for a thorough examination of the pending claims in the subject application. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Farrow* (U.S. Patent No. 4,851,635). Claims 2 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the aforementioned rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, and including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has also reminded Applicant of the proper language format for an abstract.

Applicant has added claims 8-10. Applicant has amended the claims so that all § 112 rejections have been addressed. Applicant has also amended the Abstract. Applicant, however, respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims under § 103. Though the following traversal remarks appear to be directly solely at independent claim 1, since claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, the traversal remarks are also directed at dependent claims 2-10.

It is Applicant's contention that the Examiner is in error when he concluded that *Farrow* discloses determining a time delay between a designated peak of one half cycle of the voltage waveform and a designated

Serial No. 10/786,854  
Confirmation No. 3632

peak of a corresponding half cycle of the current waveform wherein the time delay is representative of the power factor of power supplied to the load. The Examiner based this position on FIG. 3 provided in *Farrow*. But as clearly discussed in *Farrow* and illustrated in FIG. 3, *Farrow* discloses determining a time interval,  $t_1$ , between the turn-on time of the thyristors, which is a zero crossing, and the applied power line voltage zero crossing. The amount of time the current flows past the following power line voltage zero crossing is then designated as  $t_2$ . Based on knowing  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , the power factor can be found. This disclosure in *Farrow* thus teaches away from Applicant's amended claims *Farrow* teaches using the zero crossing of both the voltage curve and the current curve to determine a time delay whereas Applicant claims determining a time delay between a peak of a half cycle of a voltage waveform and a peak of a corresponding half cycle of a current waveform.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1-10 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/786,854  
Confirmation No. 3632

If further prosecution of this application can be facilitated by telephone, the undersigned may be reached at (407) 926-7707.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry M. Sanks, Esquire  
Reg. No. 45,069  
Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A.  
390 North Orange Avenue, Suite 2500  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
Telephone: (407) 726-7707  
Facsimile: (407) 926-7720  
Email: tsanks@iplawfl.com

Certificate of Transmission

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this Response, Amendment and Remarks is being faxed to the Commissioner for Patents, Fax No. (571) 273-8300, on this 29th day of September, 2005.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Sanders